

BARSHAY, RIZZO & LOPEZ, PLLC

445 Broadhollow Road | Suite CL18

Melville, New York 11747

Tel: (631) 210-7272

Fax: (516) 706-5055

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Our File No.: BRL10042

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
CENTRAL ISLIP DIVISION**

Nikkea Rhoden, individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

Carson Smithfield, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Nikkea Rhoden, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through the undersigned counsel, complains, states, and alleges against defendant Carson Smithfield, LLC as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an action to recover damages for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (the “FDCPA”).

2. Congress enacted the FDCPA upon finding that debt collection abuse by debt collectors was a widespread and serious national problem. *See* S. Rep. No. 95-382, at 2 (1977) *reprinted in* U.S.C.C.A.N. 1695, 1696; 15 U.S.C § 1692(a).

3. The purpose of the FDCPA is to protect consumers from deceptive or harassing actions taken by debt collectors, with the aim of limiting the suffering and anguish often inflicted

by debt collectors. *Kropelnicki v. Siegel*, 290 F.3d 118, 127 (2d Cir. 2002); *Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.*, 74 F.3d 30, 34 (2d Cir. 1996).

4. To further these ends, “the FDCPA enlists the efforts of sophisticated consumers ... as ‘private attorneys general’ to aid their less sophisticated counterparts, who are unlikely themselves to bring suit under the Act, but who are assumed by the Act to benefit from the deterrent effect of civil actions brought by others.” *Jacobson v. Healthcare Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 516 F.3d 85, 91 (2d Cir. 2008).

5. As such, the circumstances of the particular debtor in question have no bearing as to the question of whether there has been a violation of the FDCPA. *Easterling v. Collecto, Inc.*, 692 F.3d 229, 234 (2d Cir. 2012). Indeed, it is not necessary for a plaintiff consumer to show that he or she was confused by the communication received. *Jacobson*, 516 F.3d at 91. Likewise, the plaintiff consumer’s actions or inaction in response to a communication from a debt collector are irrelevant. *Thomas v. Am. Serv. Fin. Corp.*, 966 F. Supp. 2d 82, 90 (E.D.N.Y. 2013).

6. Instead, “the test is how the least sophisticated consumer—one not having the astuteness of a ‘Philadelphia lawyer’ or even the sophistication of the average, every day, common consumer—understands the notice he or she receives.” *Russell*, 74 F.3d at 34.

7. If a debt collector’s communication is “reasonably susceptible to an inaccurate reading” by the least sophisticated consumer, it violates the FDCPA. *DeSantis v. Computer Credit, Inc.*, 269 F.3d 159, 161 (2d Cir. 2001). Similarly, a communication violates the FDCPA if it is “open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate,” or if the communication “would make the least sophisticated consumer uncertain as to her rights.” *Clomon v. Jackson*, 988 F.2d 1314, 1319 (2d Cir. 1993); *Jacobson*, 516 F.3d at 90.

8. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute, and a debt collector’s intent may only be

considered as an affirmative defense. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(c); *Ellis v. Solomon & Solomon, P.C.*, 591 F.3d 130, 135 (2d Cir. 2010). Likewise, “the degree of a defendant’s culpability may only be considered in computing damages.” *Bentley v. Great Lakes Collection Bureau*, 6 F.3d 60, 63 (2d Cir. 1993). A single violation of the FDCPA is sufficient to establish civil liability against a debt collector. *Id.*

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 28 U.S.C. § 1337 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d). The Court has supplemental jurisdiction of any state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

10. This court has jurisdiction over defendant Carson Smithfield, LLC because it regularly conducts and transacts business in this state, and the conduct complained of herein occurred in this Judicial District.

11. Venue is proper in this Judicial District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the conduct complained of herein occurred in this Judicial District.

PARTIES

12. Plaintiff Nikkea Rhoden (“Plaintiff”) is a natural person who is a citizen of the State of New York residing in Kings County, New York.

13. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

14. Defendant Carson Smithfield, LLC (“Defendant”) is a company existing under the laws of the State of New York, with its principal place of business in Bethpage, New York.

15. Defendant has transacted business within this state as is more fully set forth hereinafter in this Complaint.

16. Defendant regularly collects or attempts to collect debts asserted to be owed to others.

17. Defendant is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.

18. The principal purpose of Defendant's businesses is the collection of such debts.

19. Defendant uses instrumentalities of interstate commerce, including telephones and the mails, in furtherance of its debt collection business.

20. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

21. The acts of Defendant as described in this Complaint were performed by Defendant or on Defendant's behalf by its owners, officers, agents, and/or employees acting within the scope of their actual or apparent authority. As such, all references to "Defendant" in this Complaint shall mean Defendant or its owners, officers, agents, and/or employees.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

22. Defendant alleges Plaintiff owes a debt ("the alleged Debt").

23. The alleged Debt is an alleged obligation of Plaintiff to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the money, property, insurance, or services which are the subject of the transaction are primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

24. The alleged Debt does not arise from any business enterprise of Plaintiff.

25. The alleged Debt is a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

26. At an exact time known only to Defendant, the alleged Debt was assigned or otherwise transferred to Defendant for collection.

27. At the time the alleged Debt was assigned or otherwise transferred to Defendant for collection, the alleged Debt was in default.

28. In its efforts to collect the alleged Debt, Defendant sent Plaintiff an email dated February 25, 2021. (A true and accurate copy of that email is annexed hereto as "**Exhibit 1.**")

29. The email conveyed information regarding the alleged Debt.

30. The email is a “communication” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

31. The email was the initial communication Plaintiff received from Defendant concerning the alleged Debt.

32. 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) provides that within five days after the initial communication with a consumer in connection with the collection of any debt, a debt collector shall, unless the information is contained in the initial communication or the consumer has paid the debt, send the consumer a written notice containing certain enumerated information.

33. Defendant failed to send a letter containing the information required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) within 5 days of the email.

34. As such, Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) and is liable to Plaintiff therefor.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

35. Plaintiff brings this action individually and as a class action on behalf of all consumers similarly situated in the State of New York.

36. Plaintiff seeks to certify a class of:

All consumers to whom Defendant failed to send a letter containing the information required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) within 5 days of its initial communication with the consumer.

37. This action seeks a finding that Defendant’s conduct violates the FDCPA and asks that the Court award damages as authorized by 15 U.S.C. § 1692k.

38. The Class consists of more than thirty-five persons.

39. Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the Class. Common questions of law or fact raised by this action affect all members of the Class and predominate over any individual issues. Common relief is therefore sought on behalf of all members of the Class. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

40. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would

create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to the individual members of the Class, and a risk that any adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class would, as a practical matter, either be dispositive of the interests of other members of the Class not party to the adjudication, or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests. Defendant has acted in a manner applicable to the Class as a whole such that declaratory relief is warranted.

41. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect and represent the interests of the Class. The management of the class is not extraordinarily difficult, and the factual and legal issues raised by this action will not require extended contact with the members of the Class, because Defendant's conduct was perpetrated on all members of the Class and will be established by common proof. Moreover, Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in actions brought under consumer protection laws.

JURY DEMAND

42. Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of this action by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment be entered as follows:

- a. Certifying this action as a class action; and
- b. Appointing Plaintiff as Class Representative and Plaintiff's attorneys as Class Counsel; and
- c. Finding Defendant's actions violate the FDCPA; and
- d. Awarding damages to Plaintiff and the Class pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and
- e. Awarding Plaintiff's attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k, calculated on a "lodestar" basis; and
- f. Awarding the costs of this action to Plaintiff; and
- g. Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest to Plaintiff; all together with

- h. Such other and further relief that the Court determines is just and proper.

DATED: March 26, 2021

BARSHAY, RIZZO & LOPEZ, PLLC

By: s/ David M. Barshay
David M. Barshay, Esquire
445 Broadhollow Road | Suite CL18
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (631) 210-7272
Fax: (516) 706-5055
Our File No.: BRL10042
Attorneys for Plaintiff